

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 310 Case file # 95-272461.

Material Examiner Malone (RO)

Remarks:

CRM - 8393

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: STEVE ROBERTSON

Area(s) of Expertise: HAIR AND FIBERS

Review commenced at: 1:30P (Time), 9/13/99 (Date)

File #: 95-272461

Laboratory #(s): 60418012 8606629
60506010 61117034
60522028

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>VJ</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>WW</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>RI</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>TR</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: MICHAEL MALONE

Testimony Date(s): 1987 Pages: 394-435

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 60418012 60506010 Date: Sept 4, 1986
60522028

Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____

Laboratory Number: 61117034 Date: Dec 4, 1986

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ AND UNKNOWN TECHNICIANS

Laboratory Number: 60418012, 60506010, 60522028

Laboratory Number: 61117034

Laboratory Number: _____

Page 1 of 3

Initials: SR

CRM - 8394

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: SUBMITTING AGENCY LETTER DATED APRIL 15, 1986,

TELEPHONE MESSAGE DATED 4/28/86 SPECIFYING WHICH HAIR/FIBER TO EXAMINE

Results of Review

File #: 95-272461

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q30, Q64, Q77, Q94

K2, K25, K26, K29

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☐ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials SMW

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

#1. DOCUMENTATION IS INSUFFICIENT TO DETERMINE IF TESTS WERE
DONE IN A SCIENTIFICALLY ACCEPTABLE MANNER. IT DOES APPEAR THAT
THE SIGNIFICANT HAIR COMPARISONS WERE CONFIRMED BY A SECOND EXAMINER.

#2. THE TECHNICIAN DOES NOT DOCUMENT THE RECOVERY OF ANY HAIR
FROM Q30, Q77, Q94 OR MOST OTHER Q ITEMS.

THERE IS NO DATA TO SUPPORT THE REPORTED RESULTS OF
THE COMPARISON OF THE K28 GLOVE, THE Q41 IMPRESSIONS AND
THE IMPRESSIONS FROM VICTIM'S RESIDENCE DOOR.

#4. SAME AS #2 ABOVE

Review completed at: 4:00 P (Time), 9/13/99 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 2 1/2 hrs.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of _____ pages.

Steve Roberts
(Signature)

9-13-99
(Date)